



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,772	01/23/2002	Willem Den Boer	8733.214.20	7226

30827 7590 09/09/2003

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K STREET, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

TRINH, MICHAEL MANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2822

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/052,772

Applicant(s)

BOER ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Trinh

Art Unit

2822

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 January 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2822

### DETAILED ACTION

\*\*\* This office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on June 18, 2003. Claims were 1-17 canceled. Claims 18-29 are currently pending.

\*\*\* The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

### *Drawings*

1. The drawings in this application are objected to because Figures 1-11 in this present application are not corresponding to the same Figure 1-11 of the prior application Serial No. 08/630,984. Noted that a copy of the drawings as originally filed must be included in the 37 CFR 1.63 application papers to indicate the original content.

Consequently, the present specification does not mention and describe the Prior Art Figures 1 and 2. The present specification describes "black matrix", but not shown in Figures 6-7; etc.. Accordingly, the drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the reference sign not mentioned in the description as shown in Figures 1-2, and objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they are not do not include the reference signs mentioned in the description for Figures 6-7.

Therefore, a copy of the drawings as originally filed in the prior application Serial No. 08/630, 984 as to indicate the original content in the 37 CFR 1.63 application papers must be submitted for replacement and correction. *A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application.*

*The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.*

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

2. Claims 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 26, lines 4-5, the phrase "...over the...gate and data lines" lacks proper antecedent basis, since no previous step recites forming of gate and data lines on the substrate.

Art Unit: 2822

(Dependent claims are rejected as depending on rejected base claim)

3. Claims 18-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Original specification does not teach and support for the added limitations as follows:

a) In claim 18, lines 7-8 “forming...a plurality of data lines...”; and

b) In claim 18, last line; and in claim 20, lines 2-3, “...one of the gate and data lines...”.

Original specification does not even mention the term “data lines”.

c) In claim 18, line 14, “...each pixel electrode contacting one of the source and drain electrodes...”. Original specification does not teach and support each pixel electrode contacting the drain electrodes.

d) In claims 26, lines 4-5 for “gate and data lines; and

c) In claim 26, line 9, line 13; and in claim 28, lines 2-3 for “at least one gate and data lines”. Original specification does not even mention the term “data lines”.

(Dependent claims are rejected as depending on rejected base claim).

### ***Double Patenting***

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Art Unit: 2822

5. Claims 18-29 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,372,534 and claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,376,270.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are drawn to the same subject matter for forming a thin film transistor array, whereby the present base claims 18,22 and 26 of this application are broad enough to encompass the scope of claims 1, 5 and 9 of the Patent No. 6,372,534, and claims 1-10 of Patent no. 6,376,270, and wherein claims 18-29 are respectively anticipated by claims 1-12 of the Patent No. 6,372,534. Employing an organic insulating film or a photo-imageable polyimide insulating film having low dielectric constant for reducing crosstalk in forming a liquid crystal display device would have been obvious, wherein alternatively using a photosensitive polyimide layer or a non-photosensitive polyimide layer is well known in the art.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's amendment and remarks filed on June 18, 2003 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

\*\*\*\*\*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael M. Trinh whose telephone number is (703) 308-2554. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30 Am to 4:30 Pm.

Art Unit: 2822

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amir Zarabian can be reached on (703) 308-4905. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Oacs



Michael Trinh  
Primary Examiner